DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 441 HE 035 945

AUTHOR	Mayhew, Matthew J.; Grunwald, Heidi E.
TITLE	Factors that Contribute to Faculty's Incorporation of Diversity-Related Content into Their Course Materials.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Course Content; Cultural Awareness; *Diversity; *Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This study examined the factors that predict whether college faculty incorporate diversity-related content into their course material and whether the decision to include this type of content is affected by personal beliefs and experiences with diversity. The sample consisted of 336 faculty members at a large midwestern, predominantly white, public university (40.3% response rate). The survey instrument was adapted from one used by the Higher Education Research Institute. By accounting for personal demographics, professional characteristics, beliefs about and experiences with diversity, and perceptions of institutional and department commitment to diversity, the proposed model has an 85% success rate in predicting which faculty members choose to incorporate diversity-related material and which do not. In terms of its ability to predict whether faculty will incorporate diversity-related content into course materials, race is a much stronger predictor for males than for females. Study findings indicate that, after controlling for all other variables, participation in activities designed to promote diversity on campus is one of the main predictors of the incorporation of diversity-related materials in the classroom. (Contains 5 tables and 20 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: FACULTY DIVERSITY

ED 477 441

Factors that Contribute to Faculty's Incorporation of Diversity-Related Content into Their Course Materials

2003 AERA Annual Meeting

April 21 to 25, 2003

Chicago, Illinois

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Mayhew

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Submitted by: Matthew J. Mayhew & Heidi E. Grunwald

Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education

University of Michigan

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Address: CSHPE, 2102 School of Education, 610 East University, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

HE035945

Factors that Contribute to Faculty's Incorporation of Diversity-Related Content into Their Course Materials

Institutions are increasingly recognizing the educational value of diversity in the classroom and its role in positively affecting student-learning outcomes (Astin, 1993; Hurtado & Dey, 1993, 1997; Maruyama, Moreno, Gudeman, Harvey, & Marin, 2000; Hurtado, 2001; Milem, 2001; Gurin, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002). As a result, many institutions have initiated system-wide reform efforts to improve the extent to which classes address knowledge about diverse groups and issues of diversity as part of the curriculum (Gurin, 1999). To ensure the success of these curricular-based reform efforts, campus leaders have scrambled to procure and maintain the commitment of faculty – many times, to no avail (Zemsky, 1997; Gonzalez & Padilla, 1999; Harshbarger, 1989).

In their effort to understand why faculty resist organizational reform efforts of this nature, Gonzales and Padilla (1999) observed that the extent to which faculty engaged in reform efforts was due, in large part, to two factors: goal congruence and perceived viability of achieving change. When the goals of the faculty and the institution were congruent and faculty had high expectations that the proposed innovations were feasible, faculty were willing to engage in reform efforts. When either of these components was weak, faculty willingness to engage in reform efforts declined or they disengaged entirely. Similarly, this idea of "congruency" is supported in work by Harshbarger (1989) who identified congruence or incongruence of personal values and perceived institutional values as one of many factors that motivated faculty to engage in institutional reform efforts. Although neither of these studies speak directly to diversity-related initiatives, their conclusions are applicable to research that has specifically addressed

why some faculty are motivated to sustain institutional commitments to diversity, while other faculty are not.

Although many faculty appreciate the educational value of diversity, many are still resistant to the process of integrating diversity-related content into their course materials (Maruyama et al., 2000). Milem (2001), Hurtado (2001), and Maruyama and Moreno (2000) have identified some of factors associated with predicting the likelihood that faculty will include diversity-related material into their course content; among these factors are personal demographics (e.g., race, gender), professional characteristics (e.g., tenure, rank), perception of institutional commitments to diversity (e.g., perceptions of institution as having a high level of curricular diversity), perceived value of diversity as a beneficial educational outcome, personal beliefs about diversity, faculty's personal experience with diversity, and faculty participation in diversity-related activities (e.g., workshops). With the exception of Milem's (2001) study, most of the research efforts in this area examined only one or two of these factors as possible determinants of faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials.

As a result, there is a need for research that examines the multiplicity of factors that lead to faculty's decision to incorporate content designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues into their course materials. This study seeks to meet this need by determining which factors predict whether or not a sample of 336 faculty incorporate diversity-related content into their course material and whether or not the decision to include content of this type is affected by their personal beliefs and experiences with diversity. To this end, we examine how demographic information, professional characteristics, perceptions about departmental and institutional commitments toward diversity, personal beliefs about diversity, and informal and

formal experiences with diversity predict faculty's use of diversity-related material in the classroom. Our hope is that the results of this study will not only contribute to the emergent literature on diverse teaching and learning environments, but that they will be of some value to administrators interested in institutional planning and management as institutions strive to motivate faculty to engage in system-wide reform efforts.

Literature Review

> "As educators we must address these basic challenges for American pluralism across the curriculum--in the classroom, in the co-curriculum, in the intersections between campus and community. In short, this diversity that is part of American society needs to be reflected in the student body, faculty and staff, approaches to teaching, and in the college curriculum" (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 1995, p. 8).

The tumultuous national ethos concerning issues of diversity in higher education reflects the urgency and necessity of understanding how an institution exercises its commitment to providing diverse teaching and learning environments. Nowhere should the institution's commitment to diversity be more readily evidenced than in the college curriculum. Hurtado and Dey (1997) note the benefits of including diversity in the curriculum: "such curricular innovation heightens student awareness and knowledge of particular groups in American society and increases criticism of the status quo, thereby establishing an avenue for critical thinking among students"(p .413). For the most part, faculty understand the positive affects of incorporating diversity into the college curriculum (Hutado & Dey, 1993; Maruyama et al., 2000), yet many still show signs of resistance towards integrating diversity-related content into their course materials (Maruyama & Moreno, 2000).

In an effort to try and understand the factors that contribute to this resistance, a series of studies have investigated the effects of racial climate variables and faculty characteristics on the likelihood that faculty will incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials (Maruyama et al., 2000; Hurtado, 2001; Milem, 2001). For example, Hurtado (2001) analyzed data from the 1989-1990 Faculty Survey administered by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute of over 16,000 faculty at 159 medium and higher selective predominantly White institutions from across the country. Findings suggest that women were significantly more likely than men to require reading on racial/ethnic or gender issues in their courses; similarly, African American faculty were the most likely to report having required readings on gender or race/ethnicity in their courses, with Asian American faculty being the least likely.

Similarly, in a study designed to assess university faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom, Maruyama and Moreno (2000) administered the Faculty Classroom Diversity Questionnaire to a representative national sample of 1500 college and university faculty at Research I institutions. Results show that although the majority of faculty value diversity in the classroom as an agent that helps students achieve the goals of a college education and helps the faculty members develop new perspectives on their own teaching and research, the majority of these faculty report making no changes in their classroom practices. In addition, although faculty report being well-prepared and comfortable to teach diverse classes, only about one-third of them actually raise issues of diversity and create diverse work groups in the classroom. These results differed as a function of the faculty's professional characteristics and demographics: senior faculty members (in terms of tenure and rank) were found to be somewhat less positive about the value of diversity and less likely to address issues of diversity; faculty of color and female faculty viewed the climate for diversity as less positive, reported the

benefits of diversity as more positive, felt better prepared to deal with diversity, and reported that they were more likely to address issues of diversity.

Milem (2001) completed the most comprehensive study of factors that contributed to faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content in their course materials. Using the 1992-93 survey of 35,061 college and university faculty conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute, he identified four outcomes related to maximizing the benefits of racial diversity in teaching and learning: teaching practices associated with active learning, faculty participation on research on race, ethnicity, and gender, faculty attendance at workshops on racial awareness and curriculum inclusion, and faculty inclusion of readings on the experiences of diverse racial and ethnic groups in the curriculum. Of particular interest to this study is the latter outcome that addresses faculty commitment to diversity as an expression of their willingness to include diversity in their curriculum. Results showed that only fourteen percent of faculty report incorporating diversity-related content into their courses. Of these fourteen percent, faculty of color (with the exception of Asian American faculty) were at least twice as likely as White faculty to integrate diversity-related content into their curricula; women were also twice as likely as men to report that they incorporate reading on racial issues in their classes. Overall, factors predicting curricular inclusion of diversity-related content included academic discipline, gender, race, perceived institutional commitments to curricular diversity, perceived emphasis of institutional commitments to civic responsibility, and faculty interest in research and teaching. From this study, it is clear that there are a number of factors that explain why some faculty incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials and why others do not.

A summary of findings from these studies suggest that many factors contribute to faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related materials into their course content.

Interestingly, it appears that either unintentionally or intentionally, this outcome (i.e., the likelihood that faculty has or has not incorporated diversity-related materials into their course content) has served as a conceptual proxy reflecting faculty's commitment to issues related to diversity. For this reason, it is important that more research be conducted that addresses the multiplicity of factors that explain faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials.

The purpose of this study is to examine the multiplicity of factors that lead to faculty's decision to incorporate content designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues into their course materials. This study differs from other research efforts in many ways. First, this study was designed with the explicit purpose of assessing how faculty view and experience diversity at their institution; faculty were asked about their beliefs and experiences with diversity related to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and religion. Second, this study provides information about faculty's views of and experiences with diversity on a large, predominantly White, public campus; much of the previous work in this area use data from a variety of different institutions. Using samples from multiple institutions has its merit; however, such large-scale studies make findings somewhat inaccessible to institutional researchers interested in integrating findings from these studies into their unique institutional contexts. Third, data for this study were recently collected in January of 2002; although recently published, much of the data analyzed for existing research in this area was collected over ten years' ago. Finally, this study analyzes a number of factors to collectively explain the likelihood of faculty to incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content; these factors include demographic information, professional characteristics, perceptions about departmental and institutional commitments toward diversity, personal beliefs about diversity, and informal and formal experiences with diversity.

Data and Methodology

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 336 faculty at a large, Midwestern, predominantly White public university. Of the 833 faculty solicited for participation in the study, 336 faculty returned useable surveys; this yielded a response rate of 40.3%. See Table 1 for a comparison of demographic information for this sample with that of the entire faculty as reported by the institution. The percentages show that the 336 faculty in this sample slightly over-represents non-tenure track and female faculty. The sample was not weighted for non-response bias because demographic data could not obtained for non-responders. Therefore, the results from this study should be interpreted with caution.

***Insert Table 1 Here ***

Instrument

The survey instrument used for this study was adopted from a diversity climate survey that was developed at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at University of California at Los Angeles. HERI's survey was adapted from a diversity climate survey previously developed at University of California at Berkeley. The survey questions have been tested over time and continue to hold content validity. Cronbach's alpha was used as a measure of reliability for a factor analysis designed to test how well the questions on the survey measured the particular constructs of the survey (e.g., experience with diversity, beliefs about diversity, etc.); alpha levels for this instrument indicated that the survey was well within the limits of acceptable reliability, using standard statistical conventions. In addition, this survey included some open-

ended items; some of the verbatim responses to these items are used to support conclusions in the discussion section of this paper.

Variables

The first dependent variable used in this study was a dichotomous response to the question, "in the past year, have you incorporated content designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues into your courses?" Respondents were instructed to answer "yes" or "no" to this item. Based on preliminary findings, a second dependent variable was identified for additional analyses; this variable also asked faculty to indicate, with a "yes" or "no," their response to the following question, "in the past year, have you participated in organized activities (conference, workshop, etc.) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues?" [1]

Independent variables investigated for both analyses are described in Table 2; these include faculty demographics, professional characteristics, perceptions of institutional and departmental commitment to diversity, experiences with, and beliefs about diversity and participation in organized activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues.

For the second analysis, participation in organized activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues served as the dependent variable; the pool of independent variables used in this analysis was the same as those used in the first analysis, with one exception. For the second analysis, an additional variable that asked whether or not faculty had taught a course in diversity was included in the model; including this variable provides specific

[1] The organized activities (conferences, workshops) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues were not mandatory. The purpose of these activities varied; however all were designed to engage faculty in issues relating to diversity in an effort to create a welcoming environment for all people in the classroom and on campus. How faculty were invited also varied; sometimes they received a general invitation (e.g., to the whole school of education) and sometimes they received a targeted invitation from the Provost who strongly encouraging attendance, but never required it. Frequently, small honorariums ($100) were offered as incentives for faculty participation. In general, the workshops ranged in size from 20-40.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information about the characteristics of faculty members who did not teach diversity courses, but who attended diversity-related workshops.

** Include Table 2 Here**

Analysis

Descriptive and exploratory analyses of all variables were performed. This was done for two reasons: to determine the relationship between each predicting variable and the criterion and to check for significant relationships between predicting variables. Table 3 includes descriptive statistics of the two dependent variables used in the study, namely whether or not faculty incorporated diversity-related content into their curriculum and whether or not the faculty attended an activity designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues. Table 3 also breaks these variables down by race and gender.

Layered chi-square analyses for race, gender, and each outcome (i.e., incorporating diversity and attending a workshop) were performed, respectively. Results from the first analysis showed that the relationship between race and faculty likelihood to incorporate diversity-related material in their courses was statistically significant for males (X^2= 4.21, p=.03), but not for females (p=.29). As a result, an interaction variable between sex and race was computed and included in the final model predicting faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related material into their courses[2].

Results from the second layered chi-square analysis showed that the relationship between race and likelihood of attending a workshop designed to promote sensitivity to diversity was not statistically significant for either males or females; as a result, no interaction term for sex by race

[2] Note that there was one cell (Nonwhite females) that had a sample size less than 5. There was only 1 Nonwhite female who did not incorporate diversity-related content into her curriculum. This may have biased the chi-square results for females.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

was included in the model predicting the faculty's likelihood to participate in a diversity-related workshop.

*** Insert Table 3 Here ***

Examining the relationship between each predicting variable and the criterion guided the process of variable selection for the logistic regression models. Predicting variables that significantly correlated with the dependent variables were selected in an effort to improve the parsimony of the models. Preliminary logistic regression analyses were performed with 29 independent variables to predict the two outcomes: faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content into their course materials and faculty's likelihood of participating in an activity designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues. Variables that did not significantly predict either criterion were excluded from consideration in the final models.

Standard statistical conventions for logistic regression analysis indicate that at least ten observations are required for every parameter estimated in a given model (Long, 1997). Both of the models in this study used under 30 predicting variables for the 336 cases observed; this indicated that the parameters estimated for both models would be stable.

A psuedo-R^2 (Menard, 1995) statistic was calculated for each final model using the relative change in deviance to assess goodness of fit and the cross-classification table to assess the predictability of the model. In addition, in order to assess the relative strength of the predictors in the logistic regression models (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2002), continuous variables were standardized. Finally, model diagnostics were assessed through deviance residual plots.

Results

Model One: Factors that Predict Faculty's Likelihood to Incorporate Diversity-related Materials into Their Course Content

Results from descriptive analyses indicated that 69% of the faculty in this study incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials; 31% did not.

The final model predicting the faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content included twelve variables and had a valid sample size of 242. The intercept only model had a deviance of 413.2 and the final, reduced model had a deviance of 172.1; this yielded a reduction of 241.1. This reduction resulted in a pseudo-R-square for the model of .58 (Menard, 1995). The classification table showed that the final model correctly classified 85% of the faculty in terms of whether or not they incorporated diversity-related content into their curriculum. Regression diagnostics demonstrated that the deviance residuals were not normally distributed, however, scholars have warned that since residuals in logistic regression are often not normally distributed, a valid model may yield plots that suggest difficulty even though the model is well-fit (Collett, 1991).

The most powerful predictor of incorporating diversity-related content into the curriculum was whether or not faculty attended a diversity-related workshop. Next were three variables related to faculty's perception of their departments' commitment toward diversity: the degree to which faculty believed their department emphasized diversity, the degree to which they believed their Department Chair should encourage respect for group differences, and the degree to which they believed that their department was receptive to integrating racial and gender issues in courses. Having constructive discussions about sexism served as the next most powerful predictor; this was followed by faculty's personal beliefs that emphasizing diversity lead to campus disunity, beliefs about the top campus administrators genuine commitment to promoting

respect for understanding group differences, and beliefs that the scarcity of qualified women were an obstacle to increasing diversity. When compared to faculty from the Arts and Sciences, faculty in Education were less likely to incorporate diversity-related materials into the classroom. Finally, the interaction term for race by gender served as a significant predictor of the likelihood that faculty would incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials; Nonwhite females were the most likely to incorporate, followed by White females, Nonwhite males, and White males, respectively. See Table 4 for variables included in the final model and the parameter estimates for these variables, including the unstandardized and standardized logits, odds ratios and probabilities.

** Insert Table 4 Here **

Faculty Characteristics. The race by sex interaction term was significant; this indicated that the relationship between race and faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity- related content into their course materials depended on the sex of the faculty members. Controlling for all other variables, for males, the predicted odds of a Nonwhite faculty member incorporating diversity-related content into their curriculum was 88 times higher than for a White faculty member; for females, the predicted odds of a Nonwhite faculty member incorporating diversity-related content into their curriculum was only 2 times higher.

The only other faculty characteristic that was a significant predictor of faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials was the faculty member's department. Faculty in the School of Education were 84% less likely than faculty in the Arts and Sciences to incorporate diversity-related content into their classroom. There were no other significant differences between faculty from any other department when compared to faculty from the Arts and Sciences.

Institutional and Departmental Commitment. Only one variable from the set of institutional commitment variables significantly predicted faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content into their course materials. For faculty who believed that "top campus administrators were genuinely committed to promoting respect for understanding of group differences at the institution," a one-unit increase on the 4-point agreement scale (i.e., from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 4 = "strongly agree") resulted in a 54% decrease in the predicted odds that they would incorporate diversity-related material into their classroom.

Four variables from the set of departmental commitment variables significantly predicted faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related content into their course materials. For faculty who believed that their department emphasized the importance of diversity in their field, a one-unit increase in the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 2.3 times increase in the predicted odds of their incorporating diversity-related content into the classroom. Likewise, for faculty who believed that their department was receptive to integrating racial and gender issues in courses, a one-unit increase on the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 1.9 times increase in the predicted odds of their incorporating diversity-related content into the classroom. Moreover, for faculty who believed that the Department Chair should be committed to promoting respect for group differences, a one-unit increase in the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 3.4 times increase in the predicted odds that they would incorporate diversity-related content into their classroom. Only one departmental commitment variable shared a negative relationship with the outcome; for faculty who believed that the "scarcity of qualified women was an obstacle to increasing diversity in their department," a one-unit increase on the 3-point scale (i.e., from 1 = not an obstacle, to 2 = minor obstacle to 3 = major obstacle), resulted in a 73% reduction in the predicted odds of incorporating diversity into their classroom.

Faculty Experiences With and Beliefs About Diversity. Faculty experiences with and beliefs about diversity each had one significant predictor in the model, respectively. For faculty who had positive discussions about sexism with the opposite sex, a one-unit increase on the 4-point scale, (from 1 = never, to 2 = rarely, to 3 = sometimes, to 4 = frequently), resulted in a 64% increase in the predicted odds that they would incorporate diversity into their classroom. For faculty who believed that "emphasizing diversity lead to campus disunity," a one-unit increase on the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 59% decrease in the predicted odds that they would incorporate diversity-related content into their classroom.

Formal Participation in Diversity-Related Activities. Controlling for all other variables in the model, participation in activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues was the second most powerful predictor of faculty's likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials. The predicted odds that faculty will incorporate diversity-related content into their classroom was 4.48 times higher for faculty who participated in organized activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity than those faculty who did not participate in such activities. That is to say, for faculty who participate in these types of workshops, the probability that they will incorporate diversity-related content into the curriculum is 84%.

Due to the large predicting power of participation in diversity workshops on the likelihood of faculty to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials, the former was used as an outcome for a second logistic regression analysis. In an effort to maximize this study's utility for administrators interested in procuring faculty commitment to promoting diversity-related initiatives on campus, this second regression analysis was performed in order to

provide information about the characteristics of faculty who did and did not attend workshops designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues on campus.

Model Two: Factors that Predict Faculty's Likelihood to Participate in Organized Activities Designed to Promote Sensitivity toward Diversity Issues

Results from descriptive analyses indicated that 51% of the faculty in this study participated in activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues; 49% did not.

The pseudo-R-square for this model was calculated using the same equation as the previous model (Menard, 1995); this yielded a pseudo R-square of .40. The classification table showed that this final model correctly predicted 71% of the faculty members attendance at activities designed to promote sensitivity to diversity issues. The most powerful predictors of whether or not faculty attended an activity specifically designed to promote sensitivity to diversity issues was whether or not they had taught a whole course specifically designed to promote sensitivity towards diversity. This variable was included as a predicting variable in this analysis in order to control for the effects of teaching a class on diversity on participation in workshops. By controlling for this variable, the results from this model would provide administrators with information about the factors that predicted workshop attendance for faculty who are already not teaching courses related to diversity.

Faculty who had a constructive discussion with someone from a different race served as the next most powerful predictor of their likelihood to participate in workshops. Next were variables describing faculty beliefs about diversity: that the percent of minority faculty should represent the percent of minority students, that one problem with pursuing the goal of diversity is in the admission of too many under-prepared students, and that the emphasis on Western Civilization and non-dominant cultures is balanced in the curriculum. Finally, when compared

with faculty from the Arts and Sciences, faculty in the Business school were less likely to participate in workshops. Interestingly, demographics such as race and sex were not significant predictors of whether or not faculty attended activities designed to promote sensitivity to diversity-related issues; this indicated that the faculty attending these workshops represented different races, ethnicities, and genders. See Table 5 for variables included in the final model and the parameter estimates for these variables, including the unstandardized and standardized logits, odds ratios, and probabilities.

** Insert Table 5 Here **

Faculty Characteristics. After controlling for all other variables in the model, faculty demographics such as race and sex were not significant predictors of whether or not faculty attended activities designed to promote sensitivity to diversity-related issues.

Faculty in the Business School were 84% less likely to attend an activity designed to promote sensitivity to diversity-related issues than faculty in the Arts and Sciences. There were no other significant differences between faculty from any other department when compared to faculty from the Arts and Sciences.

Faculty Experiences With and Beliefs About Diversity. Having a constructive discussion about racism with someone from another racial and ethnic group was the only significant faculty experience with diversity that predicted faculty's likelihood to participate in an activity designed to promote sensitivity for diversity-issues. For faculty who had this experience, a one-unit change on the 4-point frequency scale, (from 1 = never to 2 = rarely to 3 = sometimes, to 4 = frequently), resulted in a 53% increase in the predicted odds that faculty would attend a diversity-related workshop.

Three faculty beliefs about diversity were significant predictors of faculty's likelihood to participate in diversity-related workshops. First, for faculty who believed that "the percent of minority faculty should reflect the percent of minority students on campus," a one-unit increase in the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 52% increase in the predicted odds that a faculty attended a diversity-related workshop. Secondly, for faculty who believed "the emphasis on Western Civilization and non-dominant cultures is balanced in the curriculum," a one-unit increase on the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 27% decrease in the predicted odds of attending a diversity-related workshop. Lastly, for faculty who believed that "one problem with pursuing the goal of diversity is admission of too many under-prepared students," a one-unit increase in the 4-point agreement scale resulted in a 24% decrease in the predicted odds of attending a diversity-related workshop.

Formal Participation in Diversity-Related Activities. The formal participation variable of interest for this outcome was whether or not faculty had taught a course specifically designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues. For faculty who had taught such a course, the predicted odds that they also attended a diversity-related workshop was 3.5 times higher than for faculty who had not taught such a course.

Discussion

By accounting for personal demographics, professional characteristics, beliefs about and experiences with diversity, and perceptions of institutional and department commitment to diversity, the proposed model has a 85% success rate in predicting which faculty members choose to incorporate diversity-related material into their course content and which do not. It is important for institutional leaders to understand that the decision of a faculty member to engage in institutional reform efforts intended for the classroom involves the formative interplay

between that faculty's own beliefs about diversity, experiences with diversity, and his or her perception of the institution's and department's commitment to diversity. When speaking to classroom reform, faculty are the key for moving consensus to action; their personal beliefs and experiences must be accounted for if the institutional reform effort is to be successfully implemented.

Interestingly, in terms of its ability to predict whether or not faculty will incorporate diversity-related content into course materials, race is a much stronger predictor for males than for females. Nonwhite men are 88 times more likely to incorporate diversity in the classroom than White men; Nonwhite women are only twice as likely to incorporate diversity-related content than White women. Historically marginalized and underrepresented faculty, such as female faculty, faculty of color, and GLBT faculty, may be more likely to share an expressed solidarity concerning the value of integrating diversity-related content into the classroom environment. Alternatively, White male faculty may be the least likely of all faculty groups to feel as though they have the expertise needed to effectively and passionately communicate issues concerning diversity to their students. These issues are provocative and are important areas for future research; more qualitative information concerning the reasons behind why White male faculty appear to be the most resistant of all groups to incorporate diversity-related material might serve to illumine these issues.

For institutional planners to be successful in procuring and maintaining faculty engagement in diversity-related reform efforts intended for the classroom, they need to encourage faculty to participate in activities designed to promote diversity on campus. The findings from this study indicate that after controlling for all other variables, participation in activities of this nature is one of the main predictors of faculty's incorporation of diversity-

related materials in the classroom. Perhaps, administrators could negotiate release time, stipends, or honoraria for faculty who participate in diversity-related workshops and who incorporate diversity-related materials into their course content. Perhaps participation in activities of this nature could substitute for committee work.

Why does participation in these activities motivate faculty to incorporate diversity-related materials into their courses? Perhaps, faculty who attend these workshops are more likely to have positive interactions with diverse peers; through these interactions, faculty may find a supportive venue for expressing shared commitments toward promoting diversity as an important educational outcome, or learn from the materials or testimonies presented at the workshop about innovative pedagogies for incorporating diverse materials into the curriculum. Whatever the reason, it appears that faculty have mixed impressions of workshops designed with the intention of promoting diversity; some think they are "invaluable" and should be "mandatory." Others feel as though these workshops are at best "cosmetic, with no real value." Again, more research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions and to identify the salient features of interventions that are successful in influencing faculty's decisions to incorporate diversity-related content into their course materials.

Who participates in these activities? Of fundamental interest to institutional planners and management is this preliminary look at the types of faculty who attend and who do not attend activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues. It appears as though, at this institution, the reach of these activities extends into all faculty demographic groups (e.g., White males, African American females, etc.). In addition, after controlling for faculty who already are teaching a course in diversity, it appears as though constructive discussions about racism with someone from another race or ethnic group increases the likelihood that faculty will

participate in activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues. Faculty beliefs about diversity are also influential in their decisions to attend diversity-related activities. Again, this is consistent with much of the literature on inter-group relations and how positive experiences with members across cultures have positive impacts for both White and Nonwhite faculty and students (Hurtado et al., 1998; Gurin et al., 2002). Departmental administrators and planners should provide spaces for faculty to interact informally with their diverse peers; doing so may increase faculty participation in activities designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues.

Faculty decide to incorporate diversity-related material into their courses based on their perceptions of their departments' commitment to support diversity-related initiatives, not on their perceptions of the institutions' commitment to support diversity-related initiatives. Faculty who believe that their department emphasizes the importance of diversity in their field, think that their Chair should be committed to promoting respect for group differences, and believe that their department is receptive to integrating racial and gender issues in courses are more likely to incorporate diversity-related content into their course content. On the contrary, faculty who believe that their top administrators are genuinely committed to promoting respect for group differences at the institution are less likely to incorporate diversity-related content into their courses. Collectively, these findings suggest that faculty at this large, predominantly White, public institution are more likely to be influenced by their local academic culture than their broader academic environment. It appears as though the department climate is much more influential than the institutional climate as a means for communicating the importance of diversity-related issues and subsequently, affecting change in faculty behavior. This finding has major implications for institutional managers and planners interested in procuring faculty

involvement in promoting diversity-related initiatives on campus: rally the support from the department and the support from individual faculty members will follow.

Constructive discussions about sexism with someone from the opposite sex also influences faculty's likelihood of incorporating diversity-related materials into their course contents. Similarly, faculty who have engaged in constructive discussions concerning issues of racism with someone from another race or ethnicity influences faculty's likelihood to attend workshops designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues on campus. These results are similar to findings from other studies that suggest how positive interaction with diverse peer groups can contribute to an institution's overall positive climate for diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998; Gurin et al., 2002).

Faculty's personal beliefs about diversity influences their likelihood to incorporate diversity-related content into their courses and their likelihood to attend workshops designed to promote sensitivity awareness. It appears as though an important factor to procuring faculty buy-in to the value of promoting diversity across campus is to reach faculty at the personal level. However, comparing findings across the two models, it appears that faculty beliefs have a stronger influential effect on predicting the likelihood that faculty would participate in workshops than on predicting their likelihood to incorporate diversity-related material into course content. Professionally, faculty may recognize the educational value of diversity in the classroom and i ole in positively affecting student-learning outcomes; this may result in their likelihood to try and incorporate diversity into their course materials. However, personally, faculty may not recognize the value of diversity beyond its potential for positively affecting learning outcomes; this affects their willingness to voluntarily participate in diversity-related workshops.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to the current study. The first is that the sample of faculty, although quite large for the institution, does not exactly represent the faculty on campus. This sample over-represents women (2%), minorities (7%), and non-tenured-track faculty (10%); the sample was not weighted due to the unavailability of the survey sampling percentages. In addition, the sample was not weighted for non-response bias because demographic data could not obtained for non-responders.

Finally, logistic regression, for all of its robust characteristics, is unable to detect directional causal relationships. Such a study would need a structural equation model where one could discern whether attendance at activities designed to promote sensitivity awareness toward diversity-related issues caused incorporation of diversity-related content into courses, or the reverse: incorporation of diversity-related content into courses caused attendance at activities designed to promote sensitivity awareness toward diversity-related issues.

Conclusion

For institutional planners to be successful in procuring and maintaining faculty engagement in diversity-related reform efforts intended for the classroom, they need to encourage faculty to participate in activities designed to promote diversity on campus. In addition, they need to procure departmental support of institutional initiatives designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity-related issues. At the department level, department chairs should create more opportunities for faculty to have positive interactions with each other; these constructive experiences affect faculty views and experiences with diversity. Whatever the strategy, it is important for institutional managers to exhaust all means necessary to impress upon the faculty the urgency and seriousness of the diversity-related reform effort at hand. Taking

these steps will help align the goals of the institution with those of the faculty and ultimately lead to more diverse classrooms and more enriching learning environments for students.

Table 1
Demographic Breakdown of Sample of Faculty Compared to the Institutional Percentages

	Sample (%)	*Institution (%)*
Tenure Status		
Tenured	67	69
Tenure Track	16	24
Non-Tenure Track	17	7
Race		
White	86	90
Nonwhite	12	10
Gender		
Male	59	69
Female	38	31

Table 2
Independent Variables Used in the Logistic Regression to Predict Whether or Not Faculty Incorporated Diversity-Related Content into the Classroom

Theoretical Factor	*Independent Variables*	*Levels of Independent Variables*
Professional Characteristics	Tenure Status	Not on tenure track
		Currently on tenure track
		Currently hold tenure
	Department	Arts and Sciences
		Education/Applied Profs
		Business /Administration
		Fine Arts
		Engin./Applied Science
Demographics	Race	White
		Nonwhite
	Gender	Male
		Female
	Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual
		GLBT
	Race by Gender Interaction	Race*Gender
	Time at Institution	1= 5 yrs. or less 2=5-15 3=15-25 4=25-35 35+
Perception of department's commitment to diversity	Scarcity of qualified racial/ethnic minorities	3-point obstacle scale*
	Scarcity of qualified women	3-point obstacle scale
Beliefs about department's commitment to diversity	My department emphasizes the importance of diversity in our field	4-point agreement scale**
	There is a need for more diversity in my department	4-point agreement scale
	My department is receptive to integrating racial/gender issues in courses	4-point agreement scale
	The Chair in my department should be committed to promoting respect for an understanding of group differences at this institution	4-point agreement scale
Perception of institution's commitment to diversity	Female faculty are treated fairly at this institution	4-point agreement scale
	Minority faculty are treated fairly at this institute	4-point agreement scale
Beliefs about institution's commitment to diversity	Diversity is good for this institution and should be actively promoted	4-point agreement scale
	Institution is placing too much emphasis on diversity at expense of its prestige	4-point agreement scale
	Gay and lesbian faculty at his institution are accepted and respected	4-point agreement scale
	Top campus administrators are genuinely committed to promoting respect for understanding of group differences at this institution	4-point agreement scale
	Percentage of minority faculty should reflect the % of minority students	4-point agreement scale
	This institution has achieved a positive climate for diversity	4-point agreement scale
	The emphasis on Western Civilization and non-dominant cultures is balanced in the curriculum	4-point agreement scale
Beliefs about diversity	One problem with pursuing the goal of diversity is in the admission of too many underprepared students	4-point agreement scale
	Emphasizing diversity leads to campus disunity	4-point agreement scale
	Affirmative action leads to the hiring of less qualified faculty and staff	4-point agreement scale
Informal experiences with diversity	Positive discussion about racism with someone from another racial group	4-point frequency scale***
	Negative discussion about racism with someone from other racial group	4-point frequency scale
	Positive discussion about sexism with someone from opposite sex	4-point frequency scale
	Negative discussion about sexism with someone from opposite sex	4-point frequency scale
Formal participation in diversity-related activities	In the past year, have you participated in organized activities (conferences, workshops, etc.) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues?	Yes, No

* Obstacle scale (1=not an obstacle, 2= minor obstacle, 3=major obstacle)
** Agreement scale (1=disagree strongly, 2= disagree somewhat, 3= agree somewhat, 4=agree strongly)
*** Frequency scale (1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=frequently)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Percentage of Faculty Who Incorporate Diversity-related Content and Who Attend Activities Designed to Promote Sensitivity Toward Diversity Issues by Race and Sex

Variable	Incorporate Diversity	
	No (%)	*Yes (%)*
Males		
White	44 (n=75)	56 (n=94)
Nonwhite	23 (n=6)	77 (n=20)
Females		
White	18 (n=21)	82 (n=93)
Nonwhite	8 (n=1)*	92 (n=12)
	Attend Workshop	
	No (%)	*Yes (%)*
Males		
White	51 (n=86)	49 (n=82)
Nonwhite	50 (n=13)	50 (n=13)
Females		
White	47 (n=53)	53 (n=61)
Nonwhite	31 (n=4)	69 (n=9)

* Note there is only 1 Nonwhite female that did not incorporate diversity-related content into her curriculum.

Table 4
Significant Predictors of Faculty Integration of Diversity-Related Content into Course Materials (N=242)

Construct	Variable	β	SE(β)	OR = e^{β}	π_i	β Scaled
	Constant	-4.71	2.14	.009		5.00
Faculty Characteristics	Education/Applied Profs (Arts and Sciences)	-1.83	0.74	0.16*	0.13	-1.83
	Race (White)	4.49	1.33	88.64**	0.99	4.49
	Sex (Male)	0.68	0.48	1.98	0.66	0.68
	Sex*Race Interaction (White, Male)	-3.73	1.76	0.024*		-3.73
Departmental Commitment	Scarcity of qualified women are an obstacle to increasing diversity.	-0.97	0.31	0.38**	0.27	-0.67
	My department emphasizes the importance of diversity in our field	0.83	0.29	2.30**	0.70	0.86
	My department is receptive to integrating racial/gender issues in courses	0.65	0.20	1.92**	0.66	0.68
	The Chair should be committed to promoting respect for group differences	1.23	0.39	3.43**	0.77	0.74
Institutional Commitment	Top campus administrators are genuinely committed to promoting respect for understanding of group differences at this institution	-0.82	0.29	0.44**	0.31	-0.83
Faculty Experiences With Diversity	Had discussion about sexism with opposite sex and it affected me in a positive manner	0.49	0.15	1.64**	0.62	0.66
Faculty Beliefs about Diversity	Emphasizing diversity leads to campus disunity	-0.37	0.19	0.69*	0.41	-0.39
Formal participation in diversity-related activities	In the past year, have you participated in organized activities (conferences, workshops, etc.) designed to promote sensitivity toward diversity issues? (No)	1.50	0.44	4.48**	0.82	1.50

Pseudo R-square=.58; Variables in ( ) indicate the reference groups for categorical predictors; * p<.05, **p<.01

Table 5
Significant Predictors of Faculty Participation in Activities Designed to Promote Sensitivity Towards Diversity Issues. (N=236)

Construct	Variable	β	SE(β)	OR = e^{β}	π_i	β Scaled
	Constant	0.79	0.77	2.22		1.54
Faculty Characteristics	Business School (Arts and Sciences)	-1.92	0.47	0.15**	0.13	-1.92
Faculty Experiences with Diversity	Had discussion about racism with someone from another race/ethnicity and it affected me in a positive manner	0.42	0.12	1.54**	0.60	0.55
Faculty Beliefs about Diversity	Percent minority faculty should reflect the percent minority students on campus	0.42	0.13	1.52**	0.60	0.50
	Emphasis on Western Civilization and non-dominant cultures is balanced in the curriculum	-0.31	0.13	0.73**	0.42	-0.39
	One problem with pursuing the goal of diversity is admission of too many under-prepared students	-0.27	0.77	0.76*	0.43	-0.35
Formal participation in diversity-related activities	In the past year, have you taught a course specifically designed to promote sensitivity to diversity issues? (No)	1.24	0.39	3.47**	0.78	1.24

Pseudo R-square=.40; Variables in ( ) indicate the reference groups for categorical predictors; * p<.05, **p<.01

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (1995). American pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy. Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A.W. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Cohen, P., Cohen, J., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2002). Applied multiple regression: Correlation analysis for the behavioral science. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 3rd edition.

Collett, D. (1991). Modeling binary data. London: Chapman & Hall.

Gonzalez, K.P. & Padilla, R.V. (1999). Faculty commitment and engagement in organizational reform. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (24th, San Antonio, TX, November 18-21, 1999).

Gudeman, R.H. (2001). Faculty experience with diversity: A case study of Macalester College. In G. Orfield (Ed.), Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of Affirmative Action. Cambridge, Harvard. Education Publishing Group, pp. 251-276.

Gurin, P. (1999). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. In The compelling need for diversity in higher education, Gratz et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75231 (E.D. Mich.) and Grutter et al. v. Bollinger et al. No. 97-75928 (E.D. Mich) (pp.99-234). Ann Arbor, Michigan. The University of Michigan.

Gurin, P., Dey, E.L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on student outcomes. Harvard Educational Review, 72(3), 330-366.

Harshbarger, B. (1989). Faculty commitment to the university: Influences and issues. The Review of Higher Education, 13, 29-45.

Hurtado, S. (2001). Linking diversity and educational purpose: How diversity affects the classroom environment and student development. In G. Orfield (Ed.), Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of Affirmative Action. Cambridge, Harvard. Education Publishing Group, pp. 187-203.

Hurtado, S. & Dey, E. L. (1997). Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity. In M. Peterson, D. Dill, L. Mets & Associates (Eds.), Planning and management for a changing environment, pp 405-431.

Hurtado, S. & Dey, E. L. (1993). Promoting general education outcomes. Paper presented at the annual forum at the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, May, 1993.

Hurtado, S. Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R. & Allen, W. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. The Review of Higher Education 21(3) 279-302.

Jennings, J. (ed.). (1998). Diversity, pedagogy, and higher education: Challenges, lessons and accomplishments. Trotter Review. Massachusetts University, Boston, MA, William Monroe Trotter Institute.

Long, J.S. (1997). Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Maruyama, G., & Moreno, J.F., (2000) University faculty views about the value of diversity on campus and in the classroom. In G., Maruyama, J.F., Moreno, R.H., Gudeman, & P. Marin, P. (Eds.) Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms. American Council on Education, Washington D.C http://www.acenet.edu.

Maruyama, G., Moreno, J.F., Gudeman, R.H., & Marin, P. (2000). Does diversity make a

difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms. American Council on Education, Washington D.C. http://www.acenet.edu.

Menard, S. (1995). Applied logistic regression analysis. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Milem, J.P. (2001). Increasing diversity benefits: How campus climate and teaching methods affects student outcomes. In G. Orfield (Ed.), Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of Affirmative Action. Cambridge, Harvard. Education Publishing Group, pp. 233-249.

Zemsky, R. (1997). Turning Point. Policy Perspectives, 7, 1-10.

HE035945

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Factors that Contribute to Faculty's Incorporation of Diversity-Related Content into Their Course Materials	
Author(s): Matthew J. Mayhew, Heidi E. Grunwald	
Corporate Source: University of Michigan	Publication Date: 6/2/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Matthew	Printed Name/Position/Title: Matthew Mayhew	
Organization/Address: University of Michigan CSHPE, 2117 SEB 610 E. University Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48109	Telephone: (734) 615-3349	FAX: (734) 764-2510
	E-Mail Address: mmayhew@umich.edu	Date: 6/2/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)